UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/798,014	03/10/2004	Tae-ahn Jahng	001227/1368	4949	
	7590 09/24/200 STROOCK & LAVAN		EXAMINER		
180 MAIDEN LANE NEW YORK, NY 10038			CUMBERLEDGE, JERRY L		
NEW TORK, I	N1 10038		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			3733		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/24/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Interview Summary	10/798,014	JAHNG, TAE-AH	N				
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	JERRY CUMBERLEDGE	xe] t. 5,573,520); Mart N/A. to if an agreement upled to a pedicle in of the Schwartz ideration will be new agreed would render the would render the two been filed, APP TY DAYS FROM TI, WHICHEVER IS					
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):							
(1) <u>Jerry Cumberledge</u> .	(3)						
(2) <u>Giuseppe Molaro</u> .	(4)						
Date of Interview: 22 September 2008.							
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]							
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.						
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1,15 and 24</u> .							
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Leone (US Pat. 5,488,761); Schwartz et al. (US Pat. 5,573,520); Martin (US Pat. 5,672,175)</u> .							
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.							
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Proposed claim amendments for claim 1 (e.g. rod coupled to a pedicle screw) would most likely overcome the 102 rejection of Leone. Arguments directed to the combination of the Schwartz et al. embodiments would most likely be found to be persuasive. Further search and/or consideration will be necessary.</u>							
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)							
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTIFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERPREDICTION OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SUBSTAN	last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, V	been filed, APPI ' DAYS FROM T WHICHEVER IS	LICANT IS HIS				
/Jerry Cumberledge/							